

VZCZCXYZ0005
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0112/01 0361546
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 051546Z FEB 08
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1029
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000112

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS)
NSC FOR SMITH
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP UP FOR
WEEK ENDING FEBRUARY 1, 2008

This is CWC-05-07.

SUMMARY

11. (U) During the week of January 28, the Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) began to tackle the draft text of the Review Conference report but spent more time debating the provisional agenda than examining the text. The German delegation has begun informal discussion of industry inspection issues. A video-conference between the Technical Secretariat and the U.S. National Authority addressed logistical issues in the first sampling and analysis exercise in the United States.

WEOG MEETING

12. (SBU) On January 28, the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) met immediately prior to the meeting of the Open Ended Working Group. Few WEOG members were prepared to comment on Block 2 of the RevCon text. Of note was a recommendation from the UK to include a reference (in the context of the General Purpose Criterion) to the future possibility of amending the schedules of chemicals. Italy expressed support for this initiative and approached the Del after the meeting to solicit U.S. support. Del explained that the U.S. is not currently in a position to support this. (Del request: Del understands guidance on this topic has not been finalized, but requests background information and talking points on the U.S. position be provided as soon as possible.)

13. (U) Kimmo Laukkanen (Finland), the Article VII facilitator, announced his departure from The Hague in May and noted the need for a new facilitator. Laukkanen plans to organize a consultation before EC-52 to discuss any activities since CSP-12, as well as

possible report language for EC-52.

OWEG: PREPARATIONS FOR THE REVIEW CONFERENCE

¶4. (U) On January 28, Amb. Parker (UK) chaired the eighteenth meeting of the OWEG to discuss: (1) the draft provisional RevCon agenda; (2) the second section of the draft RevCon report; and (3) participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the RevCon.

¶5. (U) Discussion of the provisional agenda took far longer than expected, re-hashing positions raised at previous meetings. There was a marked division with Iran and India on the one hand calling for a simplified agenda with no deviations from that of the First RevCon, and a number of WEOG states on the other hand supporting the Chair's proposal to include new points (e.g., the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB)). Questions ran from what is meant by "the work of the Organization" to whether the SAB should be a sub-heading under another item, to whether it was even appropriate to single out the SAB, given the existence of other advisory bodies. Other points of discussion included the relationship of the OPCW to other international organizations (para 9f) and the contribution of the OPCW to international efforts against terrorism (para 9g). Near the end of discussion, Iranian Amb. Ziaraan changed tact by requesting a laundry list of problematic additions to skew the agenda toward CW destruction. Amb. Parker quickly intervened, noting the obvious contractions between the request and Iran's initial position.

¶6. (U) With almost no discussion on Block 2 of the draft text, Amb. Parker announced that the complete list of NGOs and "eminent individuals" proposed to be invited to the RevCon would be available shortly, and requested comments by the next meeting, scheduled for February 8. The NGO meeting, separate from the plenary, will likely be held at the OPCW on Wednesday of the first week of the Review Conference, which should allow time for completion of the national statements, but avoid the more intense negotiations expected during the second week.

¶7. (U) Parker again requested delegations to notify the TS as soon as possible regarding the possibility of ministerial level attendance at the RevCon. He also informed delegations that OPCW Legal Adviser Onate has provided legal advice on amending the rules of procedure to establish a regional rotation of the chairmanship. This advice should be available to the RevCon Working Group in the near future; Del is working to obtain an advance copy. Finally, Parker reminded delegations that national statements can be posted on the external server upon request. Del understands Washington is still clearing the U.S. paper in response to the Director General's report, and believes its submission will be important in adding to the list of positions that have been articulated in writing, which currently include the NAM and EU common positions.

INCREASING OCPF INSPECTION NUMBERS

¶8. (U) On January 30, Delrep participated in a meeting called by the German delegation to discuss "increasing OCPF inspection numbers." The French, UK, and Japanese delegations also attended. The paper the German delegation shared in advance of the meeting (faxed separately to State/ISN and Commerce) assessed their estimation of the distribution of OCPF

inspections in the future if the overall number of OCPF inspections were to be increased. With as little an increase as from the 2008 budget number of 118 OCPF inspections to 130, the Chinese would hit their treaty-mandated Schedule 3/OCPF cap, with a maximum of only 14 OCPF inspections. The number would have to be increased to 220 before the next country (Germany-10) would hit its cap, and a further increase to 260 would bring Japan (17) and Korea (7) to their caps. The U.S. would still not hit its cap at that high inspection level. Also, this type of significant increase would only slightly increase the inspections in countries like Iran (2 to 4) and Pakistan (1 to 2). The general theme was, therefore, whether further increases in OCPF inspection numbers could be justified given that the new methodology does not appear to result in significant inspection increases in some countries of greater concern.

¶9. (U) Japan reminded the group that the situation presented by Germany is exacerbated by the TS practice of only allowing 5-percent of OCPF inspections within a given year to be subsequent inspections (i.e., inspections at sites that have been previously inspected). By Japanese assessment, a country like Pakistan would be completely out of the OCPF inspection regime in 20 years or less.

¶10. (U) The UK delegation acknowledged that the DG,s new methodology will not necessarily give us what we want in distributing inspections more broadly, but they questioned what else could be done. In their view, any additional numbers of OCPF inspections are of broad benefit, even if they occur at sites in a WEOG country or Japan, and they reminded the group that this was consistent with the EU common position

on the matter. They also feel that the distribution of inspections outside of WEOG/Japan would balance out over time.

¶11. (U) In the end, the group concluded that the only way to really ensure OCPF inspections in more countries, within the current methodology, was to work toward a decision on VA Part IX, para 11(c) (i.e., proposals by States Parties). The group also felt that, if consultations were to occur on OCPF site selection, that they would be best focused on this remaining element, giving the new TS methodology time to be amply applied and evaluated.

¶12. (U) On related topics: Germany raised the fact that they will insist during the RevCon on a strict maintenance of the "hierarchy of risk." Although other delegations disagreed, the UK and Delrep pointed out that this need not be argued, as OCPF inspection numbers could be further increased sharply (e.g., doubled) without impacting any perceived balance between hierarchy and inspection rate. The German delegation also pointed out that efforts made to improve OCPF declarations - to give more accurate information about "main activities," for example) in an effort to better focus on those plant sites of greater relevance to the Convention will likely result in greater targeting of the more sophisticated sites in the WEOG and Japan. The UK delegation also reported that the TS believes they need a technical change to the Convention to allow them to use open source information for site selection purposes. (Del comment: This may be why the DG included this issue in the RevCon paper (WGRC-2/S/1, dated 27 November 2007), although it is not clear in the paper whether the TS will request a change in the Convention to allow them to use open source material, or whether the DG was asserting the right of the TS to use open source data. End comment.)

¶13. (SBU) At the close of the meeting, the UK

delegation shared with Delrep a "Restricted" UK non-paper entitled "OCPFs: What They Are and Why They Are Important." This has been scanned and transmitted separately.

VIDEO TELECONFERENCE: SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS LOGISTICS

¶14. (U) On January 31, Delrep participated in a video teleconference with TS representatives (Bill Kane, Horst Reeps, Gary Mallard, Jutta Hauschild, Dennis van der Vegt, Violeta Artos, Peter Boehme, Im-Suk Yang) and the U.S. National Authority (ISN/CB and Commerce-TCD). The participants discussed the logistical challenges that arose during the November 2007 Schedule 2 inspection involving sampling and analysis in the U.S.

¶15. (U) The meeting centered on five topics: (1) the notification, (2) Customs-related activities, (3) the movement of dangerous goods, (4) the performance of TS contractors and sub-contractors throughout the

SIPDIS process, and (5) technical equipment inspection. On each topic, the National Authority identified the problems that arose, the reasons behind the problems (if known) were discussed, and clear next steps were identified with the goal of preventing a recurrence of these problems in the future.

¶16. (U) A similar meeting (again by video teleconference) will be held soon to address the policy issues that arose during this inspection. Del plans to again help to coordinate that meeting and to participate.

COORDINATION FOR CLOSE ALLIES LUNCH

¶17. (SBU) Del has confirmed the attendance of representatives from The Hague and capitals at a working lunch hosted by Ambassador Javits on February ¶11. The primary aim will be to discuss preparations for the RevCon, but any topics of particular concern for EC-52 (e.g. Russia's Maradykovsky facility agreement and verification plan) may also be raised. Del requests interagency guidance on RevCon preparations/strategy and the upcoming Executive Council session be provided prior to the lunch.

¶18. (U) Javits sends.
Arnall